

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 93 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #361
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 3 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 361

Today's Topics:

 5 wpm is Enough
 Codeless Tech Debate (2 msgs)
 Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective) (2 msgs)
 End-It All Now, Please...
 Power Level Limits

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 2 Oct 93 20:43:38 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 5 wpm is Enough
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

There is no longer any good reason to require knowledge of Morse code
at speeds greater than 5 words per minute. In the old days manual cw
was the primary mode of all hams and the ability to use Morse code at
high speeds was an important ability of the skilled operator.

Today cw on the hf bands is just one of many modes that todays hams
have available. But the rules still require mastery of Morse code at
13 wpm for hf access. For many hams this _one_ mode requires over 75
% of the study time for the ham licensing test. Why, when there are so
many options for ham radio, is mastery of Morse code still required.
Morse is no longer used for marine radio and has few applications
outside of amateur radio. Morse is becoming an obsolete skill about
as useful, to most people, as the ability to harness a team of horses

to a buggy.

Listening to the hf bands indicate that Morse fails as a lid filter. All of the lids on 160 through 15 meters passed a Morse test at 13 + wpm. It is time to change the requirements.

Reduce the code requirement to 5 wpm. Expand the part of the test on operating methods and practices. Change the format of some parts of the test to fill in the blanks rather than multiple guess. Make the test more meaningful to current and future hams.

It is time to stop considering the ability to receive 20 wpm Morse as the only important skill in ham radio. Morse is only one of many methods a ham may use, it is time to end its dominance of the tests.

There is a group of people who try to relive old days of the fur trappers, They use horses to pull their wagons, dress in buckskin. shoot black powder rifles and try to relive the 1850s, they are called buck skinners. Morse code fans are the buck skinners of amateur radio. They are welcome to practice their "mode of the past" but there is no reason to force it on the rest of us.

Down with the non-codeless hams !

Rod Anderson N0NZ0

--
Rod Anderson | "I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
| fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four | Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: 1 Oct 93 14:16:19 GMT
From: ogicse@mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Dan.Pickersgill.N8PKV@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>
> jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

> >
> >>I do think there are others like me - people with this peculiar
> >>inability to distinguish closely-spaced sounds.

I have a friend who could pass all the theroy tests (even the commercial tests) with just a little study. However, his hearing will not distinguish between a dit and a dah. A, N, I and M all sound the same to him. Our only hope is to find someone to give him the 5WPM code test AT 5WPM _CHARACTER SPEED_. Where the differances are barely enough for him to attempt copy. After that is the old medical waver (see below).

>
> In article <kg7bk.749109358@indirect.com>
> kg7bk@indirect.com (Cecil Moore) writes:
>
> >I've often wondered about handicapped hams. I know a blind guy who can
> >copy CW just fine but has no idea what frequency he's on. Are deaf hams
> >limited to vhf/uhf packet because they can't copy CW?
>
> Unless they can transcribe Morse code by watching a flashing light or
> sensing the vibrations of a buzzer with their fingertips, they are
> pretty much out of amateur radio.

At a time when amature radio is dying for lack of interest and band width is being lost because of lack of use, that is a sorry comentary! Sorry because some people actually feel that way!

They can now get a medical waver,
> of course, but that wouldn't agree with the prevailing dogma that
> anyone can learn the code and they wouldn't be "real hams".

You have to pass 5 WPM! FIRST! The medical waver is for the 13/20 WPM tests.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^

>
> >... With all the digital modes, including computer-copied CW, it would
> >seem that manually copying CW is like having to know how to use a slide
> >rule... Hey, Jim, maybe they will let you use your slide rule to copy CW.
>

* Origin: The Chicago Internet Gateway [CHIGATE.MCS.COM] (1:115/119.0)
SEEN-BY: 115/747 2200/3 2112
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112
2200/3 2112
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112

Date: 2 Oct 93 21:35:34
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <aba_9310020805@yyz.mbsun.mlb.org>
mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Bruce.Burke.Sp.App (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

> Morse Code is required below 30Mhz by international law.

A treaty that is widely ignored by other nations, and a requirement
that nearly got changed at the last WARC if I'm remembering correctly;
I seem to recall that it took some convincing by the U.S. delegation
to keep the code requirement. Basically, the U.S. seems to be the
last major hold-out on Morse code below 30 MHz.

-Steve, WB3I

Date: 1 Oct 93 20:02:28 GMT
From: ogicse@mbsun.mlb.org!yyz!115-119!Ben.Coleman@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> According to other VE sources in this area, there have actually been
> cases where an individual "guessed" correctly on 7 out of the 10
> questions, but the VE team was not going to award him credit and
> a CSCE because he did not have the necessary copy on his code
> sheet. Apparently, only after a very loud disagreement on the
> part of several of the testing VEs did they "agree" to give him
> the credit.
>
> Personally, I think it is a very dangerous precedent. Do we
> next allow VEs to decide whether or not the person who took the
> theory exam "really knew" the theory, or did the testee
> just "guess" - thus allowing the VEs to throw the testee's
> answer sheet out the door? As it is now, VEs are allowed
> to put their own "comments" on a person's CW disability
> waiver - hmmm, I guess VEs will have to be accredited in
> all fields of the medical profession soon too, huh?

On the other hand, as an examiner, what do you do when an examinee has the
requisite 7 correct answers on the 10-question test, but his/her copy
doesn't even have enough to make guesses(e.g. at most 2 or 3 character

groups scattered seemingly randomly through the text)? At that point, you can be 99% sure that the examinee's answers come not from his/her code copy, but from his/her neighbor's test.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |
| AX.25: NJ8J@W4Q0.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally out of date." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+
```

```
---
* Origin: The Chicago Internet Gateway [CHIGATE.MCS.COM] (1:115/119.0)
SEEN-BY: 115/747 2200/3 2112
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112
112
@PATH: 115/999 119 747 2200/2112
```

Date: 2 Oct 93 21:31:26
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <TiVqac1w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us>
ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

> On the other hand, as an examiner, what do you do when an examinee has the
> requisite 7 correct answers on the 10-question test, but his/her copy
> doesn't even have enough to make guesses(e.g. at most 2 or 3 character
> groups scattered seemingly randomly through the text)? At that point, you
> can be 99% sure that the examinee's answers come not from his/her code copy,
> but from his/her neighbor's test.

What would you do if the "copy sheet" had only notes about the content of the QSO, and no actual copy? You know, if he copied the test the same way that most people actually operate CW...if they write down anything at all, that is. That's fine with me. Or if somebody turns in a blank "copy sheet"? Maybe he copied it in his head and has a good memory. The case that you bring up is a little harder for me to judge, because the random groups seem to indicate an attempt to actually copy the code down on the sheet. No matter what, though, I wouldn't try to accuse someone of cheating on a test unless I actually saw him doing it.

-Steve, WB3I
ARRL VE

Date: 2 Oct 93 17:10:27 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cbr600@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: End-It All Now, Please...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Please, everyone...let's end this no-code debate now...The no-code license is a part of Amateur Radio now, so the debate over it is useless. As for the HF privledges, international treaty states any amateur radio station in the world operating below 30 mHz must express some knowledge of code, so HF privledges can not be given to the no-coders. The new no-code license allows many other people to be involved in a terrific hobby (like myself, who was scared away from Amateur Radio by the code requirement), and fulfills the need for more licensed amateur radio operators, to help the amateur service retain frequencys. Face it, you OF's, the No-Coders are here. Face it, No-Coders, at no time soon are we going to have HF privledges, so you might as well start practicing Morse.

Standard Disclaimers Apply...

Jeremy L. Utley	I didn't do it, nobody saw me
cbr600@ksuvvm (Bitnet)	do it, You can't prove any-
cbr600@matt.ksu.ksu.edu (Internet)	thing. - Bart Simpson
N0YAX@WZOM.KS.USA.NA	

Date: 1 Oct 1993 14:35:47 +0100
From: swrindle@gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!warwick!
news.wlv.ac.uk!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Power Level Limits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello Everybody,

I hope I've posted this in the right place - this seems the most relevant of the various newsgroups I get. The following note appeared in the German magazine DUBUS intended, primarily, for VHF/UHF DXers. Has anybody got any further information on this particularly the quoted ANSI standard ? This is causing some concern in Europe (I am chairman of the RSGB's VHF Committee - we worry about this sort of thing)

Planned new regulations put a threat on DX-operation on VHF/UHF and SHF in Germany. German BMPT (like FCC in USA) tries to limit output power to 100W on 144, 432 and 1296 MHz. Second, very hard

limits are required for unwanted emissions of amateur stations (-120 dB!!). The reason given for the first measure is possible hazardous impact on the health because of EMR. The second measure has been forced by the broadcast and television companies who want to protect their cable networks against amateur radiation. These efforts of German PTT are symptomatic for administrations in Europe and all VHF amateurs should be aware that future common European regulations would be the worst common divisor according

to our experiences with EC-bureaucrats. Also in the US the new ANSI Standard C95.1-1992 which has been adopted by FCC, will force administrations to reconsider amateur power levels on

VHF/UHF.

Rainer DJ9BV

```
+-----+-----+
| From: Peter Burden, School of Computing & IT | When all else fails --- |
| University of Wolverhampton                 |   read the instructions   |
| Phone: (+44 902)-322105 (DDI)                |   |
| Fax: (+44-902)-322680                         | If the good Lord had meant |
| Internet email to jphb@scitsc.wlv.ac.uk       |   meant us to program in Ada |
| Packet radio messages to G3UBX @ GB7MAX        | why did he give us Fortran |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: 2 Oct 93 17:48:18 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <30SEP93.05370230@skyfox>, <1993Sep30.170201.27381@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CE6z14.4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: The Canadian Perspective Returns

In article <CE6z14.4B7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <1993Sep30.170201.27381@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

```
>...
>
>> On VHF/UHF
>>we hear stories of jamming of repeaters and foul language as well,
>>some of which may be done by newly minted amateurs who have not been
>>formally tested for Morse skills, but mostly done by Morse tested
>                                ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>>amateurs of the same kind who infest HF. In the areas where this
> ^^^^^^^^
>
>Trying to pass opinion as fact again? And your rebuttal: "On MY repeater,
>we DF every jammer and almost always it's a Morse tested amateur <blah,
>blah, blah>..."
```

As I clearly noted, such activity has been occurring for many years before the deletion of the code testing requirement. We were hearing the same stories out of LA 10 years ago that we're hearing now. And a perusal of enforcement notices announced by the FCC still shows that a preponderance of those cited hold code tested licenses.

As a matter of fact, I can't say we DF every jammer on our machine. That's because we've never had an instance of intentional jamming on the machine. There's the occasional amateur who sits on his mike, and a couple of times somebody has unintentionally crossbanded us with another machine, but none of the jamming problems we hear about on the left coast. We have had a few instances of rude behavior and foul language, but those offenses were committed by hams who signed their calls, and all but one of them was General class or higher. The exception is a long time coded Tech. It wouldn't do them any good to try to sign a bogus call either, they're well known long time licensees whose voices are easily recognized by the locals. We did have one long running interference problem from a W4 in Macon who was running a two meter split site repeater with the link on our input frequency contrary to the bandplan. I was finally able to "reason" with him and got the link removed. (I've been known to "reason" rather forcefully.)

I have experienced jammers and anonymous foul mouthed hams on other machines in the past. Every one of those machines was a club operation that was intended mainly as an autopatch substitute for a cellular phone, and every one of them had numerous rules and procedures enforced by zealous channel cops. A small group of us erected our current repeater several years ago to get away from all that. We have no club, we have no autopatch, and we have no rules. All we have is a big "Howdy, welcome aboard" to anyone who drops by. We have a large number of users, and our biggest problem is convincing them that we don't want their money and that there are no meetings for them to attend.

In conversations with other trustees in the area, I haven't heard the first claim of *increased* instances of bad behavior in the last 2.5 years. We're not some backwater aberration either. We have the widest area coverage machine in the 12th largest metropolitan area in the US. Many of our users are newly minted Techs who are always made to feel welcome. Perhaps that has something to do with the lack of problems.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | "If 10% is good enough | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | for Jesus, it's good | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | enough for Uncle Sam." | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -Ray Stevens |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #361
